

*Criminal Code*

If it is not too late, I ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to divide this bill. We could then decide in favour of some provisions and against some others.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot decide in favour of this bill, although we shall vote in favour of the amendment. We feel, however that it makes sense. We want to help religious bodies and school boards wishing to conduct lotteries in order to pay their debts or to promote education, as they have no other means to do so.

Several other organizations could benefit by it.

Those who want a house would need lotteries, because they cannot afford to build a house and borrow money at a 10 per cent interest rate.

Mr. Speaker, due to all the consequences of the present disastrous administration, we have to resort to means that I would term illegal, because I believe lotteries are illegal. Indeed, it is not altogether legal to squeeze money out of the taxpayers by extraordinary means, on a few individuals' instigation in order to obtain the necessary money to finance various institutions.

On that point, Mr. Speaker, we could say many things.

For example, we might refer to the hospitals' financial problems, even though they are being subsidized by the provinces. The latter can no longer meet their obligations towards the hospitals, and the federal government does absolutely nothing to lower the interest rate in order to allow the hospitals to carry on their work.

Charity institutions are in the same boat. They need capital, and they are provided with money at a 10 per cent interest.

Municipalities do the same when urgent works have to be undertaken.

Many things are physically, if not financially possible. We should take the time needed to face facts and to ask ourselves frankly if we can finance all that is physically possible by other means, instead of amending the existing laws which now exploit the people. We are satisfied with talking of something else, wasting our time trying to impose lotteries and all sorts of systems which can in no way solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to solve that problem. We are here to find solutions to the various problems of our system, to build, not only to destroy. The present system is most certainly not constructive, since the 10 per

[Mr. Latulippe.]

cent interest rate is destructive. That is robbery, and it has been the downfall of many economic organizations in Canada. Not one member of the Progressive Conservative party—

Mr. Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[English]

The question is on the amendment by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say ye.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion negatived on division.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 75 the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The house will now proceed—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order and invite the attention of the Minister of Justice and those who are acting as house leaders of the other parties. I am sure we all agree with Your Honour's decision to defer the taking of the recorded divisions on this and other amendments, but I wonder whether I may draw attention to the slight problem we are now running into.

If the debate on the other two amendments included in the first eleven is prolonged beyond tonight, hon. members will realize what this will mean. Tomorrow and Thursday we are to have a debate on a defence and external affairs matter. I presume the debate on the Criminal Code may continue on Friday, but one knows that attendance in the house on Friday is not always 100 per cent.

I wonder, therefore, whether there would not be general agreement in the house to take the votes on the matters that have been deferred at nine thirty o'clock tonight, whatever stage we may have reached? In other words, we could take the votes on those amendments that have been disposed of not later than 9.30 p.m. If amendments Nos. 11 and 9 have also been disposed of they could be voted on at that time. I am not trying to cut off the debate on the amendments that my